

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/734,015	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KEIGHTLEY, KYM JOHN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher Boswell	<b>Art Unit</b> 3676	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** pending

(1) Christopher Boswell.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Clay Cunningham.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 June 2005

**Time:** 2:00 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 6, and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested changing the limitation of both "a cavity" in claim 6, and "a cut out" in claim 6 to recite the limitation--an aperture-- to better define the limitation. The examiner further suggested including the limitations of claim 13 into claim 12 to further define the interaction between the first arm and the rack. The applicant's representative agreed to the suggested changes.